

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

I. Introduction

This Amendment after allowance is being filed to correct errors introduced into the claims apparently as a result of the Examiner miss-transcribing the Proposed Amendment Applicant's undersigned representative submitted on April 1, 2010.

II. Discussion of Amendments

The amendments made herein are intended to clarify the claims. In entering the proposed amendment the Examiner added "predetermined contiguous image areas," to each of independent claims 23, 28, 30 and 34. This seems to be simply be an error in entering the proposed amendment which results in redundant text being included in the independent claims. **This amendment deletes this redundant text added as a result of the Examiner's amendment and thereby clarifies the claims without affecting their allowability.**

In amending claim 34 the Examiner added text to a portion of the claim which was the same as added to claims 23, 28 and 30. It appears that the Examiner did not appreciate that the wording of claim 34 differs slightly from the other claims and that the proposed amendment to claim 34 used slightly different language so that the claim would be grammatically correct and internally consistent.

The amendment to claim 34 made herein amends claim 34 as was intended in the proposed amendment which was to be entered by the Examiner. As amended herein claim 34 is

grammatically correct and allowable for the same or similar reasons that the other claims are allowable.

Claim 39 has been amended to add a semicolon thereby making the claim more readable. The amendment to claim 39 does not affect the scope or allowability of the claim.

**II. Correction to Interview Summary Dates Indicated in
Interview Summary Submitted on April 1, 2010
And Summary of Telephone Interviews/Calls
Which Occurred on April 1, May 5, and May 6, 2010**

In the April 1, 2010 Proposed Amendment and Interview Summary Applicant incorrectly indicated that the telephone interviews summarized therein occurred on March 22, 2010 and March 24, 2010. The actual dates of the interviews were Monday March 29, 2010 (not March 22) and March 31 (not March 24, 2010).

On April 1, 2010 an additional interview occurred with the Examiner in which Applicant's undersigned representative authorized entry of the Proposed Amendment by way of an Examiner's amendment if it would put the application in condition for allowance. No prior art was discussed during the April 1, 2010 interview.

On May 5, 2010 Applicant's undersigned representative Michael P. Straub called Examiner Tung T. Vo and left a message noting that various errors were introduced into the claims during entry of the Proposed Amendment by way of the Examiner's amendment. Applicant's representative indicated that he would be submitting an Amendment after allowance to clarify the claims and seeking entry of the Proposed Amendment as was intended. On May 6, 2010 the Examiner called back Applicant's representative and left a message indicating

that an Amendment after allowance was a suitable way of addressing the errors corresponding to entry of the proposed amendment.

III. Conclusion

Entry of this amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

May 6, 2010

/Michael P. STRAUB, Reg. #36,941/
Michael P. Straub Attorney
Reg. No. 36,941
Tel.: (732) 936-1400